

No. ID/ED 72-82/20598.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Subhash Chand and the management of Haryana Roadways, Faridabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad, constituted,—*vide* Government Notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245, dated 7th February, 1958, read with notification No. 5414-3Lab-68/15254, dated 20th June, 1968, under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Subhash Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/ED 41-83/20605.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Mast Ram and the management of M/s Tirupati Udyo Ltd. 15, Milestone, Mathura Road, Faridabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad constituted,—*vide* Government notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245, dated 7th February, 1958 read with notification No. 5414-3Lab-68/15254, dated 20th June, 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Mast Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/SPT/193-83/20612.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Sukhdev and the management of M/s. Kumar Industries, E-13, Industrial Area, Sonapat, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing :

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to Labour Court, Rohtak constituted under section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,—*vide* Government notification No. 3864-ASO(E)-Lab-70/13648, dated 8th May, 1970 read with Government notification No. 9641-1-Lab-70/32573, dated 6th November, 1970 the matter specified below, being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sukhdev was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/ED 35-83/206019.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Sanjiwan and the management of M/s Kapur Sons, Plot No. 1/41-A, DLF, Industrial Area, Mathura Road, Faridabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad, constituted,—*vide* Government notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245, dated 7th February, 1958 read with notification No. 5414-3Lab-68/15254, dated 20th June, 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication :

Whether the termination of service of Shri Sanjiwan was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?